
S604: SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

CASSIDY R. SUGIMOTO, PH.D.

THURSDAYS, 9:30-12:15, SPRING 2011

LI030

Examines the ways in which scholarly information is produced, disseminated, and evaluated. Print and digital modes of production, as well as formal and informal models will be discussed. Challenges and opportunities for providing access to information will be examined, focusing on the open access movement and institutional repositories. An emphasis will be made on the role of the information professional in scholarly communication. Methods of evaluation will focus on quantitative methods, such as bibliometrics and usage statistics.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Upon successful completion of this course, students should be able to:

- Provide a definition for scholarly communication;
- Understand the strengths and weaknesses of various publishing models;
- Analyze current empirical literature on scholarly communication;
- Explain the role of the information professional as a digital steward;
- Design and implement an evaluation of a scholarly communication product or process;
- Discuss the future of scholarly communication and publishing.

FACULTY CONTACT INFORMATION

Email: sugimoto@indiana.edu

Telephone: (812) 856-2323

Office: LI013

Office hours: By appointment

HONOR CODE

This class, as all classes at Indiana University, requires that students abide by the “Code of Student Rights, Responsibilities and Conduct.” Please familiarize yourself with this document:

<http://www.iu.edu/~code/>

Students found to be engaging in plagiarism, cheating, or other types of dishonesty will be reported to the Dean's Office for appropriate action. In particular, please understand the various nuances of plagiarism and avoid engaging in this type of behavior.

GRADES

Assignments and percentage of final grade:

- Discussion Leadership: 10%
- Position statement on a publishing model: 20%
- Final Project: 50%
- Participation: 20%

Grades will be assigned on an A, B, C, D, F scale. The following definitions of letter grades have been defined by student and faculty members of the Committee on Improvement of Instruction and have been approved by the faculty (November 11, 1996) as an aid in evaluation of academic performance and to assist students by giving them an understanding of the grading standards at SLIS.

Grade	GPA	%	MEANING
A	4.0	96-100	Outstanding achievement. Student performance demonstrates full command of the course materials and evinces a high level of originality and/or creativity that far surpasses course expectations.
A-	3.7	90-95	Excellent achievement. Student performance demonstrates thorough knowledge of the course materials and exceeds course expectations by completing all requirements in a superior manner.
B+	3.3	87-89	Very good work. Student performance demonstrates above-average comprehension of the course materials and exceeds course expectations on all tasks as defined in the course syllabus.
B	3.0	84-86	Good work. Student performance meets designated course expectations, demonstrates understanding of the course materials and is at an acceptable level.
B-	2.7	80-83	Marginal work. Student performance demonstrates incomplete understanding of course materials.
C+	2.3	77-79	Unsatisfactory work. Student performance demonstrates incomplete and inadequate understanding of course materials.
C	2.0	74-76	
C-	1.7	71-73	Unacceptable work. Coursework performed at this level will not count toward the MLS or MIS degree. For the course to count towards the degree, the student must repeat the course with a passing grade.
D+	1.3	69-70	
D	1.0	67-68	
D-	.07	65-66	
F	0.0	<65	Failing. Student may continue in program only with permission of the Dean.

All assignments must be handed in on their due dates. If you cannot deliver an assignment or a project on the date it is due, it is your responsibility to discuss your situation with the instructor in advance of

the due date. Late assignments will automatically lose one-letter mark from the grade they would have received had they been turned in on time.

ASSIGNMENTS:

Discussion Leadership (10%)

To prepare you for future roles as instructors, educators, presenters, professionals, professors, etc., you will be asked to participate as a discussion leader for one week of the semester. This involves three things:

- 1) You must assign a reading to the class for this week. This must be sent out at least one week prior to the start of class.
- 2) You must bring discussion questions to class.
- 3) You will lead the discussion of the articles.

Selection of your week will occur during the first class of the semester. You will be graded on your knowledge and understanding of the readings as well as your ability to encourage class participation.

Position statement (20%)

Libraries and librarians are often asked to advocate in support of certain publishing models, access models, and legislation that impacts the access of information. Therefore, for this assignment, you will be asked to take a position on one model of publishing and advocate for that position. Your work should be written in a persuasive manner, but should include citations to support your assertions. The paper should be at least 750 words in length. APA-style is preferred.

Final Project (50%)

The final project for this class is an in-depth study of a particular aspect of scholarly communication. The project could take a number of forms: research report, research proposal, literature review, etc. The objective of the study is for you to engage deeply with one area that particularly interests you.

For example, if you were to do the research report, you might:

- Choose a sample of faculty members from various disciplines and compare the genres in which they publish;
- Identify the journals with the highest Impact Factors in a given discipline and examine the copyright agreements for each of those journals; or
- Examine the difference in citation counts to articles published under different publishing models.

If you were doing the proposal, you might, design a study to:

- Evaluate the use of an institutional repository by students and faculty;
- Evaluate the impact of format (print or digital) on the use of journal articles; or
- Evaluate the use of digital libraries in the research of faculty in the humanities.

For a literature review or historical review, you may consider:

- Providing a meta-review of discussions of the economic implications of different publishing models;
- Examining the evolution of the role of the librarian in scholarly communication; or
- Analyze the role of the university in scholarly publishing.

The final project will take various forms, depending on the topic and format you choose. However, all final projects should be at least 3500 words. The preferred citation style is APA; however, you may choose another style if justified by the topic and potential venue of publication.

The topic and format must be submitted for approval by February 10th (but you are encouraged to begin before that date). This should consist of a short email outlining your plan for the project and the format you will submit (report, proposal, literature review, etc.). As you begin working on the final project, please feel free to send the project to the instructor at any stage for feedback, revisions, and guidance. Unlimited revisions are accepted and encouraged for this project. A rough draft (in any stage of the process) will be due for the peer review workshop on March 24th. The final project will be due on April 30, 2011.

Participation (20%)

This class includes a large amount of discussion. Therefore, to get the most out of the class you need to be in attendance and engaged. Five main criteria will be used in determining your participation grade:

- 1) Attendance in class and prompt arrival to the beginning of class;
- 2) Evidence of thorough reading of the required material;
- 3) Contribution to class discussion;
- 4) Contribution to news updates;
- 5) Demonstration of respect for peers.

If you cannot be in class for any reason, please inform the instructor.

SCHEDULE AND READINGS

Required book:

Borgman, C.L. (2007). *Scholarship in the Digital Age: Information, infrastructure, and the Internet*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Recommended book:

Cronin, B. (2005). *The hand of science: Academic writing and its rewards*. Maryland: Scarecrow Press.

January 13, 2011

Topic: Introduction and overview

- Review the syllabus
- Introduction
- Definitions of scholarly communication

Readings:

- Syllabus
- Borgman, Chapter 4 “The continuity of scholarly communication”

January 20, 2011

Topic: Scholarly publishing models

- Genres
- Modes of production
- Differences by disciplines

Readings:

- Borgman, Chapter 7, “Building and Infrastructure for Information”
- Borgman, Chapter 8 “Disciplines, Documents, and Data”
- Cronin, Chapters 1-2

Recommended:

- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary cultures, texts and interactions*. In, *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing* (1 -19). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

January 27, 2011

Topic: Scholarly publishing stakeholders and economics

- Relationships between stakeholders
- Economics of scholarly publishing

Readings:

- Guedon, J.-C. (2001). In Oldenburg’s long shadow: Librarians, research scientists, publishers, and the control of scientific publishing. From *Creating the Digital Future* (138th Association of Research Libraries Membership Meeting), Toront, ON. Available at: <http://www.arl.org/resources/pubs/mmproceedings/138guedon.shtml>

- Houghton, J.W., & Oppenheim, C. (2009). The economic implications of alternative publishing models. *Prometheus*, 26(1), 41-54. Available at: <http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/content~db=all~content=a920247424>
- Waltham, M. (2010). The future of scholarly publishing among social science and humanities association: Report on a study funded by a planning grant from the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 41(3), 257-324.

February 3

Guest lecture: Blaise Cronin 10:45a.m.

Topic: Authorship

- Big Science
- Hyperauthorship
- Collaboration
- Meaning of authorship across time and disciplines

Readings:

- Cronin, Chapter 3 [Dean Cronin will expect that you have read this thoroughly]
- Cronin, Chapter 5
- Frandsen, T.F., & Nicolaisen, J. (2010). What is in a name? Credit assignment practices in different disciplines. *Journal of Informetrics*, 4(4), 608-617.

Recommended:

- Borgman, Chapter 2, "Building the scholarly infrastructure."

February 10, 2011

No class as Dr. Sugimoto will be at the iConference. However, please read the text below in preparation for February 17.

Topic: Open Access

- Models of open access

Readings

- Borgman, Chapter 5, "The Discontinuity of Scholarly Publishing"

February 17, 2011

Topic: Open Access

- Impacts of open access

Readings:

- Gargouri, Y., Hajjem, C., Lariviere, V., Gingras, Y., Brody, T., Carr, L., & Harnad, S. (2010). Self-selected or mandated, Open Access increases citation impact for higher quality research. *PLOS One*. Available at: <http://eprints.ecs.soton.ac.uk/18493/>
- Shaw, P. (2010). Open Access, Impact Factors and Scientific publishing. Available at: <http://www.galter.northwestern.edu/news/index.cfm/2010/10/1/Open-Access-Impact-Factors-and-Scientific-Publishing>

- Lehman, H. (2010). Open Sesame: The Open Science and Open Data movements and their implications for librarians. *OLA Quarterly*, 16(3), 29-32. Available at: http://data.memberclicks.com/site/ola/olaq_16no3.pdf

February 24, 2011

Guest lecture: Donald Case 9:30a.m.

Topic: Evaluation I

- Bibliometrics

Readings:

- Ucak, N.O, & Al, U. (2009). The differences among disciplines in scholarly communication: A bibliometric analysis of theses. *Libri*, 59(3), 166-179.
- Kousha, K. & Thelwall, M. (2008). Sources of Google Scholar citations outside the Science Citation Index: A comparison between four science disciplines. *Scientometrics*, 74(2), 273-294.
- Case, D., Miller, J.B. (2011). Do bibliometricians cite differently from other scholars? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* [in press]

Recommended:

- Bornmann, L., & Daniel, H.D. (2008). What do citation counts measure? A review of studies on citing behavior. *Journal of Documentation*, 64(1), 45-80.

March 3, 2011

Guest lecture: Stephen Bensman 9:30a.m.

Topic: Evaluation II

- Usage statistics
- Ethnography
- Interviews

Readings:

- Bensman, S.J. (2000). Probability distributions in Library and Information Science: A historical and practitioner viewpoint. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(9), 816-833.
- Bollen, J., & van de Sompel, H. (2008). Usage Impact Factor: The effects of sample characteristics on usage-based impact metrics. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 59(1), 136-149.
- Harley, D., Earl-Novell, S., Arter, J., Lawrence, S., & King, C.J. (2007). The influence of academic values on scholarly publication and communication practices. *The Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 10(3), retrieved online: <http://quod.lib.umich.edu/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=jep;view=text;rgn=main;idno=3336451.0010.204>

Recommended:

- Sandstrom, P.E. (1994). An optimal foraging approach to information-seeking and use. *Library Quarterly*, 64(4), 414-449.
- Nicholson, S. (2006). The basis for bibliomining: Frameworks for bringing together usage-based data mining and bibliometrics through data warehousing in digital library services. *Information Processing & Management*, 42(3), 785-804.

March 10, 2011

Guest lecture: Katy Börner 9:30a.m.

Topic: Evaluation III

- Science mapping

Readings:

- Please browse: <http://scimaps.org/>
- Small, H. (1999). Visualizing science by citation mapping. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 50(9), 799-813.
- Boyack, K.W., Klavans, R., & Börner, K. (2005). Mapping the backbone of science. *Scientometrics*, 64(3), 351-374.

Recommended:

- Börner, K., Huang, W., Linnemeier, M., Duhon, R.J., Phillips, P., Ma, N., Zoss, A.M., Guo, H., & Price, M.A. (2009). Rete-netzwerk-red: analyzing and visualizing scholarly networks using the Network Workbench Tool. *Scientometrics*. Retrieved from: <http://ella.slis.indiana.edu/~katy/S637-S11/Borner.pdf>
- Börner, K. (2010). *Atlas of Science*. MIT Press.

March 17, 2011

NO CLASS—Spring Break

March 24, 2011

Topic: Publishers and peer review

- Roles of the editors, publishing staff, and other stakeholders
- Editing
- Peer-review models

Readings:

- Gould, T.H.P. (2010). Scholar as e-publishiger: the future of [anonymous] peer review within online publishing. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 41(4), 428-448.
- Souder, L. (2011). The ethics of scholarly peer review: A review of the literature. *Learned Publishing*, 24(1), 55-72.
- Miller, C.T., & Harris, J.C. (2004). Scholarly journal publication: Conflicting agendas for scholars, publishers, and institutions. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 35(2), 73-91.

Recommended:

- Kumar, M.N. (2010). The 'peer reviewer as collaborator' model for publishing. *Learned Publishing*, 23(1), 17-22.

March 31, 2011

Topic: Institutional repositories and digital libraries

- Role and rise of institutional repositories
- Role of the librarian

Readings:

- Brown, D.J. (2010). Repositories and journals: are they in conflict? A literature review of relevant literature. *Aslib Proceedings*, 62(2), 112-143.
- Kim, J. (2010). Faculty self-archiving: Motivations and barriers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 61(9), 1909-1922.

- Rieh, S.Y., St. Jean, B., Yakel, E., Markey, K., & Kim, J. (2008). Perceptions and experiences of staff in the planning and implementation of institutional repositories. *Library Trends*, 57(2), 168-190.

Recommended:

- Borgman, C.L. (2000). Digital libraries and the continuum of scholarly communication. *Journal of Documentation*, 56(4), 412-430.
- Coleman, R. (2009). Publishing and the digital library: Adding value to scholarship and innovation to business. *Learned Publishing*, 22(4), 297-303.

Topic: University publishers

- History of university publishers
- Role of librarians in university publishing

Readings:

- Xia, J.F. (2009). Library publishing as a new model of scholarly communication. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 40(4), 370-383.
- Jagodzinski, C.M. (2008). The University Press in North America: A brief history. *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, 40(1), 1-20.
- Thatcher, G.S. (2007). The challenge of open access for university presses. *Learned Publishing*, 20(3), 165-172.

Recommended:

- Greco, A.N., Jones, R.F., Wharton, R.M., & Estelami, H. (2007). The changing college and university library market for university press books and journals: 1997-2004.

April 7, 2011

[Guest lecture: Sherri Michaels and Jennifer Laherty 11a.m.](#)

Topic: Copyright and ethics in the library

- Issues of copyright, ownership, responsibility and ethics in scholarly communication

Readings:

- Coleman, A. (2007). Self-archiving and the copyright transfer agreements of ISI-ranked Library and Information Science journals. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 58(2), 286-296.
- Urs, S.R. (2004). Copyright, academic research and libraries: Balancing the rights of stakeholders in the digital age. *Program-Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 38(3), 201-207.
- Zhang, W.D. (2007). Digital library intellectual property right evaluation and method. *Electronic Library*, 25(3), 267-273.

Recommended:

- Prentice, A.E. (1997). Copyright, WIPO and user interests: Achieving balance among the shareholders. *Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 23(4), 309-312.

April 14, 2011

Topic: Cyberinfrastructure, e-science, and digital curation

- Technical infrastructure
- Data as scholarly communication
- Changing nature of scholarship
- Role of librarian as curator

Readings:

- Borgman, Chapter 6, "Data: Input and Output of Scholarship"

- Beagrie, N. (2006). Digital curation for science, digital libraries, and individuals. *International Journal of Digital Curation*, 1. Available at: <http://ijdc.net/index.php/ijdc/article/view/6/0>
- At least one reading from *Social Epistemology*, Volume 24, no. 3

Recommended:

- The entire issue of *Social Epistemology*, Volume 24, no. 3

April 21, 2011

Guest lecture: Jason Priem 11a.m.

Topic: Scholarship 2.0

- Wikis
- Blogs
- twitter

Readings:

- Priem, J., & Hemminger, B.M. (2010). Scientometrics 2.0: Toward new metrics of scholarly impact on the social Web. *First Monday*, 15(7). Available at: <http://www.uic.edu/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2874/2570>
- Luzon, M.J. (2009). Scholarly hyperwriting: The function of links in academic weblogs. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 60(1), 75-89.
- Black, E.W. (2008). Wikipedia and academic peer review – Wikipedia as a recognized medium for scholarly publication? *Online Information Review*, 32(1), 73-88.

Recommended:

- Priem, J., & Costello, K.L. (2010). How and why scholars cite on Twitter. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, Pittsburgh, PA, October 22-27, 2010.

April 28, 2011

Topic: Final presentations